P 7 98-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1892-93

192

(LR)

Later references.

File No. 178-92

Serial Nos. 1-9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-9

in Part B for September 1893

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Nanjundaiah of Chickkaclumna-sandra village, Anekal taluk regarding the restoration of a grove ~~to him planted by~~ his ancestors.

WD 2238—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

Form No. 3.

9935

FACING SHEET FOR FILE.

P. & A. Branch.

File No. 98 of 1892-93.

SUBJECT.

Praying for the restoration of a grove planted by the ancestors of the Peta Nayanidu of Chikka Dunnasandra, Anekal Taluk

Sent R
26/10.92

2

(14)

M^r No 10 dated 19th July
1892.

Appellant
Nanjundappa
of Chikkadunnasandra
Aneikal Taluq
Bangalore Dt

This is an appeal against the order
of the Dy Com^r dated 12th May 1892 treating
the Tope held by the Petitioner (Survey No 57) as
charitable Tope & declining to give it to the
Petitioner on Patta.—

The record of enquiry shows that the
Tope was planted (about 60 years ago) by the father of the Petitioner,
(Acres 1.28 assessed at Rs 3-8-0)
that it has been always held by the Petitioner & enjoyed jointly,
subject to an assessment of Rs 1-5-0, but
that the assessment is entered in some accounts
as "Amrai Kaudegam" under the head of
Ready money collections or Swarnadayam,
while in some the accounts of Sidhardi 1859-60 the
assessment is shown as Rupees. In Dy

Govt refused to grant a Patta on the ground that the assessment is shown in most accounts as Amani Ramayam, & it must therefore be a Govt Topes.—

We Govt consider, that under the circumstances of the Case, the Petitioner is entitled to a Patta, & the D.C. Govt will be requested to grant it accordingly.—

MM
7/8/93

GVP
15/8.

Govt.

Ptr is referred to the D.C. Govt who has been requested to grant Patta to the Petitioner for the Topes claimed.—

MM
7/8

GVP
15/8

Proceedings

Appeal Suit No 10 of
1892-93.

Appellant:— Nanjundayya
son of Siddamuni Reddi
Chikdunnasandra, Anekal
Taluk.

On the 30th of April 1891, the Appellant addressed a petition to the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, stating that his father obtained the land bearing Maji No 8 in the village for cultivation on Jamin Kandayam, in the previous Chitrabhanu and planted a tope there, that since then the tope had been enjoyed by the Appellant, a Patta for a Kandayam of Rs 1-5-0 having been issued, that he heard that it was removed from his Patta on the ground that it had been held on Maravati-

x Survey No 57, 1 acre 9 28 in extent, containing —
64 Mango trees
4 Hippe do
4 Atti do
1 Honge tree
1 Bilvapatre do
and 1 Tamarind.
(Vide Amildar's report No 83 of 24-4-92)

* 1822-23

Kandayam, that the land was first ~~obtai~~ taken on Kandayam with hies and then planted, that in the accounts of the year Sidhartthi the land is stated to be 2 Kolagas in extent, ~~used~~ with a Kandayam of 1-5-0. He prayed that the lope be assessed and a Patta be granted to him. With the above petition the appellant produced a copy of Sagumali Chit or "Kulada Chiti" purporting to have been granted by Subidar Appu Row to Siddamuniga, a Ryot of Chikdunnasandra on the 5th day of the dark fortnight of Kartika in the year Chitrabhanu. In it the Bijwari ~~used~~ of his holding and the Kandayam are stated to be 1 Kolagu & Padi and 2 Pagodas respectively, 1 Pagoda & 3 fanams being "Giraylu Kandaya" and the rest "Kavalu Kandaya".

2. The Amildar of the Anekal Taluk to whom the petition was forwarded for report, submitted with his report an extract from the Chitthaz Siddharthi, in which Maji No 8 is stated to be Siddamuni Reddi's lope having Khushki Kandayam, and which gives the boundaries, ~~and~~ Bijwari (2 Kolagas) and Kandaya (4-8)

× 7. 5. 91.

× 1859-60

* 31. 5. 9

of the land. The * report was to the effect that the land bearing Maji No 8 was given No 57 and was assessed at Rs 3-8 at the Survey, but at the time of Settlement the assessment was cancelled and the land was added to Kharab as a Sarkar Tope; that in the "Topina Patrike" of the village this +2 other topes were mentioned as Sarkar Topes, and it was also mentioned that a "Gida-Kandaya" was charged on the trees in the said topes & was being collected every year, and that the produce of the trees together with the dead branches were being taken by the Hakdars; that there was no mention in the records of Jamin Kandaya having been fixed for the topes, but a Kandayam was charged on account of the trees; and that the Chit produced by Ranjundaiya was not connected with the land in question but seemed to be a receipt granted for payment of some Kandayam.

* Survey Nos 5-9 486

25-8 — 1839-40
1 Sr 253 1846-47

Thereupon the Deputy Superintendent passed an * order to the effect that if the topes had been charged

4-6-91

with Maravali Kandaya and were at the time of Jamabandi entered in the Faisal Patrik as Sankar Lopes the Petitioners ~~might~~ ~~be~~ should be informed of the same.

* the Appellant & the claimants of S.Nos. 5-9 & 86.

3. Against this order the Appellant appealed to the Survey Superintendent on 11-6-91, but he was referred to the Revenue Authorities. Meanwhile, he again addressed the Deputy Superintendent stating that he had been enjoying the topes in question and that he had often, with the Amildar's permission, felled and appropriated dead branches, dead trees &c of the topes, and praying that the Maravali Sale might be stayed and the topes be assessed and granted to him.

× 19-6-91

4. The Deputy Superintendent directed the Amildar to report on what authority he stated, in his Ittilla No 58 (of 31-5-91), that the topes were held on Maravali or Gida Kandayam, though they had been mentioned in the Chitthas of Sidharthi to be topes having Khushki Kandayam. On 4-9-91, the Amildar examined Ramaiya Shanbhog of Shikdumma Sandra, who deposed as follows:—

* 11-7-91

"The Bijvari of Maji Nos 8 called Siddamuni Reddi's Tope is ~~dated~~ is mentioned to be 2 Kolagas, and its Kandayam to be 4½ panams Amaraji. I do not know when this and two other Topes (Maji Nos. 11 & 40) were included among Kandayam lands. In the Suvarnadaya Patti of Vikari, 1839, the Bijvari of the three topes is ~~increased~~ entered, and they are mentioned ~~to be~~ as of Amaraji Kandayam. They are mentioned to be Bagayat. From the year Sarvari* to Visvavasu* Bijvari is ~~not~~ not mentioned, and the topes are mentioned to be of purely Amaraji Kandayam. ..... The tope called Siddamuni Reddi's tope was planted and reared ~~by~~ by him. It is now in the possession of his son Ranjundaiya. The produce and the dry branches are being taken by the Kandayamdars. Besides, those of Nos 11 and 8 have obtained licenses and felled living trees. In the year Parabhava* numbers were given to these topes, and Bijvari has been mentioned in the first class accounts (Arvad number ~~kkkk~~) of this year as well as of Sidharthi,

* 1840-41
* 1845-46
* 1846-47

In the second class accounts, ~~the~~ Bijwari is not mentioned, but Kandayam is mentioned. In the Settlement accounts Amarayi Kandayam was entered according to the old references, ~~accounts~~, but and the topes have been included in Government Kharab, and the Kandayamdars have been deprived of their hak. It appears that the lands were first taken for Jamin Kandayam, and then the topes were reared there. These were not Sarkar topes before they were given on Kandayam. I do not know why these were not included in the Jamin Bab. These were not being included in the Batayi "Jare." On 10-9-91, the Amildar reported that in the Suvarnadaya Patlis of 1839 + 1840, there was a mention of "Amarayi 4½ fanams" against the name of Siddamani Reddi, but Bijwari was not mentioned; that payments were being credited to the head Amarayi; that since Bijwari was mentioned in the first class accounts from the year Parabhava, and since in the year Sidharthi, in addition to this, Amarayi Kandaya was mentioned in the column of Kandayam, there were similar

+ 1846-47
* 1859-60

~~that~~ mentions in the extract submitted by him; that the topes appears to have been planted and reared ~~up~~ by the Petitioners' forefathers; and that it was not known why they were not included in the Jamin Bab.

× 13-9-91 The Deputy Superintendent directs the Amildar to report whether the Petitioners were willing to have the lands on Bagayet-Kandayam which had been charged on the topes, saying that from the Chitta of Sidhartti, the Shanbhog's deposition and the Sagavali Chit the topes appeared to have been of Jamin Kandayam.

The Amildar stated in his report Dis 420 of 11.11.91, that proper records were not produced in the case of S. Nos 5-7 and 5-9, and that if these be confirmed to the Petitioners on Kandayam, similar orders would have to be passed on ~~many~~ similar complaints that might be brought by many persons in the Taluk.

·×· 21-11-91. Thereupon the Deputy Superintendent ×confirmed the order

with regard to S. Nos 57 & 59
passed at the time of Jama-
bandi and directed that
an order should be issued to the
Petitioners to the effect that they should
either produce records to shew
that the lands were first obtained
for Kandayam and then topes
were planted, or petition the
District authorities.

On 24th January 1892,
the Appellant presented a petition
to the Deputy Commr But
Mr Madhava Row passed the
following order (No 141 of 12-5-92):—
" It is a charitable tope and
is in the possession of Govern-
ment. If such a tope be given
to his possession, it will give
room to him somehow or other
to fell the trees and spoil the
tope. Therefore the present it should
continue to be as it is at-present."
On the 22nd June 1892, the
Appellant again addressed the
Deputy Commr, but the present
Deputy Commr declined to
interfere.

* 27-6-92

The present appeal to Govern-
ment is against the above order.
The Appellant states in his appeal
petition
(1) that his father obtained.

the land for Jamin Kandayam and improved the tope at a great cost,

(2) that under the Sarjapur Amildar's order no 620 of 29-12-69, he (Appt) obtained a license and felled dead trees, and in return planted 2 Hippe trees in the tope,

(3) that in the "Tope Patrike" * prepared at the time of Settlement the Appellant is stated to have been taking the produce of the dead branches,

(4) that the tope in question is not a charitable one, as stated by the Dy Commr in his endorsement of 27-6-92, and

(4) that three similar topes are assessed and confirmed to their respective occupants.

* Copy produced with the appeal petition

In his petition no 373, dated 9th August 92, the Appellant prays that the Shanbhog of Chikdunnasandra may be ~~directed~~ summoned to appear before the Council with

(1) the Suvarnadaya Pattis of 1839 & 1840

(2) the Patta of the tope granted to Appellant's elder brother in 1856.

(3) and that granted to the Appellant on the former's death.

The Survey Superintendent was asked in this office No 7897 of 7-12-92, to explain the circumstances under which similar Topes in Chikkanna Sandra and Surjapur were granted to owners on Survey assessment, while the Tope in question was treated as Government property.

The Survey Superintendent reports (in his letter No 929 of 3-3-93) that the cases quoted by Petitioner in Surjapur, S. Nos 364 & 365 are not parallel cases as those numbers were assessed after the Settlement on the representation of the Deputy Commr that the lands formerly paid Kandayam. He further reports that there is no proof of Petitioner's having ever paid "Kandayam" for the land he claims, and the payment of "Jar Kandayam" does not entitle him to hold the land on Survey assessment.

S.V.

Stamp Rs 2---
Dy Comr's D/27-6-92.

14

(General Serial No. 82.)

(2)

1892

No. 184

Name of Petitioner. Ranjundia

Village. Chikkadunnasandra

Taluk. Anekal

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 19th July

Date of Receipt. Do

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosures. 4

L. R. 178-92

ABSTRACT.

The Petitioner states that the Dy Comr has deprived him of his hak to a grove planted by his ancestors and prays that it may be restored to him.

S.F.
22/7

(1)

A. S. NO 10

Pet 1
F. 98-92-3

(3)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

AR. 78-92-2

The accompanying Petition No. 184
dated 19th July/92 received at the
Dewan's Office from Nanjundiah
Bhadrakumarandra, Amildar
Taluk, praying that a grove
planted by his ancestors
may be restored to him.

F. 98/92 dated 29/7/92 from the Deputy Commr Bangalore Dist. for submission of Progs with a report on the facts of the case and on the points taken in the petition.

2 The petition should be returned

By Order,

Draft Letter 29/7/92

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
29 July 1892.

29/7

Petition returned
29/7

(General Serial No. 52.)

1892. File 78

No. 373

Name of Petitioner. Ranjundayya

Village. Chikdunnasandra

Taluk. Anekal

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 9th August—

Date of Receipt. 12th August—

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One

GR 178-92-3

ABSTRACT.

With reference to his appeal about his father's land being ~~claimed~~ included among Khan lands by the Survey Authorities, Petitioner states he has found several evidences and will produce them at the time of hearing and prays for early decision.

SK

To D/Govt on Govt

Inform Petr that he may produce at the time of hearing all the evidence

drafted 6/9/92

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 373R
DATE 12-8-92

(4)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಆಸುಇ ೨೦೧೬ ಸಿಎಸ್‌ಆರ್ ೧೦೨೫ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭.೦೭.೨೦೧೬

ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಕುರಿತು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದೆ.

೧. ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ.ಎಂ. ವಿಜಯ ಭಾಸ್ಕರ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
೨. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಆರ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಮೂರ್ತಿ, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೩. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಉಮಾಶಂಕರ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೪. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀನಾರಾಯಣ, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೫. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಸುರೇಶ್ ಕುಮಾರ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೬. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎನ್. ವಿದ್ಯಾಶಂಕರ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೭. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಎಂ. ಜಾಮದಾರ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೮. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀರಾಮ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೯. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೧೦. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೧೧. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು
೧೨. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ, ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಸದಸ್ಯರು

Pet
F. 98

(6)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 373
dated 9th August 92 received at the
Dewan's Office from Ranjundayya,
Chikdunnasandra, Aneka
Taluk, complaining against the
father's lands being included amo
Kharab lands by the Survey author
ties & praying for early decision.
is forwarded, together with its one
enclosures, to the Dy. Comr, Bangalore
Distt, in continuation of this
office memo No. Pet / F. 98 dt 25/29 July
1892

From the same Dist.

D 3368 / 1892

LR 178-92-4

By Order,

Draft.

7/12/92

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 7/12 Sept. 1892

Encl returned
12/9/92

Pet F. 98 of 92

22

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
3932
18 OCT. 92
Pet 186

From The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 17th October 92

Despatched 17th October 92

Received

Enclosures No. 2 files

General No. D336
No.

In reply to memos 98 and 98 dated 26th July SUBJECT. and 12th September respectively

---

Forward with report entire records in respect of petition from Nanjundiah of Chikdanasandra Anekal Taluk praying that the grove planted by his ancestors may be restored to him.

Pshr 17/10

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the Supdt of Rev: Survey No. 7897 dt 5/12/92
P.F. 98-92

Forward to the Supdt of Rev: Survey in Mysore for reference & return with a request that the R. Papers ending with the Amrs report No. 440 of 26.4.91 regd in his yadi of 5 May 92 & the Dy Com. Bangalore may be informed with a report explaining the circs under which similar grove in Chikdanasandra & Harijapur were granted to Shanbogs on Rev: Asst: & the grove in question was treated as Govt property

Pshr 20/10

Re file of papers now in Rev: Survey Office to be returned

18/10/92

No D 336 23 Dy Commissioners Office
Bangalore District.
Dated 14th October/92

To
The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore

Sir,

In returning the enclosures received with your Special Memos No 98 and 98 dated 26th July and 12th September 1892, respectively forwarding for report petitions from Nanjundiah of Chikkadunnasandra, Anekal Talukh praying that the grove planted by his ancestors may be restored to him I have the honor to state that the grove referred to by the petitioner measures 1 Acre and 28 Guntahs and it contains 64 Mango, 4 Ippe, 9 Atti, 1 Honge and 1 Bilpatri trees This grove was held by the petitioners [redacted] Sidda Mumreddy, from a Maravati Kandayam panams. During the Survey

Settlement, the Maravali Kandayem was struck off by the Settlement Officer and the grave treated, as Government property; but Similar graves in Chikkunnasan-dra and Suryapura villages are reported to have been given to the owners on Survey Assessment

2. The Vernacular papers connected with the above, are herewith submitted for reference and obliging return.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Nagenahalli
Dy Commissioner

25 (General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Supdt of Rev. Survey in Mysore (10)

La 178. 92-b

Dated 5th

Despatched 7. Dec/92.

Received

Enclosures No. 6 & 1 file of V. papers as per margin

General No. 7897
Pet F. No. 98-92

Calling for certain revenue papers in connection with the Petition of Nanjundiah of Chikdannasandra, Nelamangal Taluk.

References to be marked.

To

The Supdt. of Revr. Survey
in Mysore.

Has the honor to forward, for reference and return, Bangalore Dy Comrs letter No. D-336, dy 14.10.92, together with the papers received therewith, as also the Petitions with enclosures from Ranjindiah of Chickdannasandra, Anekal Taluk, & to request that the Survey Supdt will be good enough to submit the papers ending with Amildars report No. 40 dy 26.4.91 referred to in his Yadi dy 5th May 1892 to the Dy Comr, Bangalore, with a report explaining the circumstances under which similar Topes in Chickdannasandra & Sarjapur were granted to owners on Survey asstt while the Tope in question was treated as Govt property.

By Order

Draft.

for Chief Secy.

(General Serial No. 30.)

9935-

1893 6 - MAR. 93

From The Supdt. of Police Bangalore

To (13)

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated Malvalli 3rd March 1893

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. with 2 files

General No. 929

No.

In reply to Docket No. 7897 of 4th Dec. 1892

SUBJECT. P.Z. 98 reminder No. 13334 of 9th Ultimo P.Z. 98-92

Submitting Vernacular Papers relating to the Petition of Nanjundiah of Chik-Dannsandra, Anekal Taluk praying for restoration of his so called ancestral Tope.

Peta Br. Mysore 6/3/93

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Lr 178-92-7

Copied 3rd August 1893

6/3/93

No 929 (13)

Survey Superintendent's Office
Maloalli 3rd March 1893

To,

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor, as requested in your Docket No. 7897 of the 7th December 1892 and reminder No. 13334 of the 9th February 1893 to forward Vernacular Papers relating to the petition of Nanjundaiah of Chik-Dannasandra, Anekal Taluk, praying for restoration of his, so called, ancestral Tope

2 You will perceive from the

the Vernacular correspondence that in the village in question there were three Topes Survey Nos. 54, 59 and 86. Of these Survey No. 54 is the Tope claimed by Petitioner Colonel Rutherfurd in his No. 1428 of the 23rd September 1891 to the Amildar was inclined to assess and give all 3 Numbers on assessment but the Amildar in his reply No. 420 of the 11th November 1891 stated that only in the case of No. 86 was there ~~a~~ presumption of "Zamin Kandayam having been paid. Consequently Colonel Rutherfurd in his Order No. 1570 while assessing No 86 refrained

refrained from pursuing the same course as regards Nos 57 and 59, leaving the claimants to prove their claim if they could.

3 The cases quoted by Petitioner in Sarjapur, Survey Nos 364 and 365 are not parallel cases as those Numbers were assessed after the Settlement, on the representation of the Deputy Commissioner (letter No 603 of 6th November 1891) that the lands formerly paid Kandayam

4 So far as I can see there is no proof that the Petitioner ever paid "Kandayam" for the Tope he claims but only "for Kandayam which would not

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

LR 178-92-8(16)

Appeal No. 10 of 13th July 1892

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Ranjan Dasappa of
Chikkadasarao and
Anekal Taluk,
Bangalore District,

Decision. of 15-8-93

This is an appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner dated 12th May 1892 treating the land held by the Petitioner (Survey No. 57) as charitable Dasa and declining to give it to the Petitioner on Patta

2. The record of enquiry shows that the Dasa (acres 1-28 assessed at the Survey at Rs 3-8-0) was planted about 60 years ago by the father of the Petitioner that it has been always

and enjoyed by the Petitioner's family, subject to an assessment of Rs 1-5-0, but that the assessment is entered in most accounts as "Amrai Kandayam" under the head of ready money collections or swarnadayam, while in the accounts of Siddhardi 1859-60 and some other accounts, the assessment is shewn as land tax. The Deputy Commissioner refused to grant a Patta on the ground that the assessment as shewn in most accounts as Amrai Kandayam, and that the Pepe must therefore be a Government Pepe

3 The Government consider that, under the circumstances of the case the Petitioner is entitled to a Patta, and the Deputy

Deputy Commissioner
will be requested to grant
it accordingly

By order

24/8/93

Redraft

29/8/93

4070-70½ Chief Secretary
R. ——— dy 29-8-93
P.F. 98-92

Copy to the Deputy Commr
Bangalore Dist with the
records received with his letter
No 336 of 14th October 1892.
Copy to the Survey Supdt with records.

By order

Chief Secretary

S.V.

3 S—

ಪ್ರ-೨೨೨೪೨೪೦೦೨೨೦
೨೦-4-9-93

No. 184

LR 178-92-9

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
4- 9 — 1893

15-

Endorsement granted to Rangiendappa of Chikkadimasandra Anekal Taluk, Bangalore Dist.

in reply to his - Petition Registered No. 184 dated 19-7-92 and Received as Govt. Zopeat the Survey Camp praying that a grove planted by his ancestors may be restored to him

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner who has been requested to grant Patta to the Petitioner for the Zope claimed

2 The rec: are returned

24/8/93

"By Order"

Recraft

Chief Secretary.

SK

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

not entitle him to hold the land
on Survey assessment.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed.t Servant

Supt. Mysore Reserve
Survey